



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,952	04/27/2005	Takehiko Aneqawa	CU-4170 RJS	2190
26530 7590 03/30/2010 LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604				
EXAMINER				
PARK, JEONG S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/30/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/532,952

Applicant(s)

ANEGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

JEONG S. PARK

Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/4/2010 has been entered.
2. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/532952 filed on 4/27/2005. The amendment presented on 2/4/2010, which amends claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 11-14, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-14 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 13 is drawn toward a computer program product in a computer readable storage medium. The computer readable storage medium is broad enough to be interpreted as a signal. The examiner suggests replacing the computer readable

storage medium with a non-transitory computer readable storage medium in the claims as well as in the specification.

Claim 14 is rejected with similar reasons as presented above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/4/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Summary of Applicant's Arguments

In the remarks, the applicant argues as followings:

Shibata in view of Kojima, and further in view of Miura fails to teach or even suggest that the server has a database which stores the unique information, the output information and the device identification information in association with each other, even after the output device outputs information onto media.

B. Response to Arguments:

In response to argument, Miura teaches as follows:

The server (a server apparatus, 109 in figure 1, has a network communication control unit, a print information analysis unit, a slip template storing unit, an image forming unit, a data storing unit, a history information storing unit, a history information analysis unit, and a database (see, e.g., paragraph [0022]) has a database (history information storing unit 115 in figure 1)(The history information storing unit 115 is a characteristic portion of the invention and stores print history information regarding the

print based on the image data for printing, see, e.g., paragraph [0027]) which stores the unique information (ID information of the operator who executed the print 204 in figure 2), the output information (print time 202 in figure 2) and the device identification information (print PC 203 in figure 2) in association with each other (see, e.g., paragraph [0028]), even after the output device outputs information onto media (In step S311, the network communication control unit 110 receives the notification showing that the print by the printing apparatus 106 has completely been finished from the client apparatus 100 side. Thus, in step S312, the history information analysis unit 116 forms the print history information. In step S313, the print history information is stored into the history information storing unit 115, see, e.g., paragraph [0037]).

Therefore, Shibata in view of Kojima and Miura teaches all limitations as presented in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0107771 A1) in view of Kojima et al. (hereinafter Kojima)(U.S. Patent No. 6,807,388 B1), and further in view of Miura et al. (hereinafter Miura)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154395).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Shibata teaches as follows:

an output information management system including an information storage medium for a user, an output device which outputs information onto media (MFP, 1 in fig 1, refers an image processing apparatus, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0025]), and a server (PC 2 in figure 1, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026]) communicably connected to the output device through a communication network,

the output device (MFP 1 in figure 1 and 2) having a reading unit (input unit 106 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]-[0030]) which reads the unique information from the information storage medium and a unit (communication unit 107 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0035]) which transmits information to be outputted onto media to the server in association with the unique information read by the reading unit (the input unit receives user's personal ID, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0042] and the communication unit transmits image data with user ID to the PC, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0046], see, e.g., steps 101 and 111 in figure 4); and

the server (PC 2 in figure 3) having a database (storage unit 207 in figure 3, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0037]) for storing the information received from the output device in association with the unique information (the image data emended user ID (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0045] and step 109 in figure 4) received from MFP are automatically stored in the storage unit, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0049]).

Shibata does not teach the information storage medium having a memory on which unique information is stored.

Kojima teaches as follows:

the secrecy management circuit (68 in figure 1) reads the content of the IC card and stores the secrecy management level registered in the IC card such as the permit level, the group ID, and the individual ID together with the user ID (see, e.g., col. 17, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Shibata with Kojima to include IC card stored the individual user ID as taught by Kojima in order to automatically give different usage right for each user based on predetermined secrecy management level.

Shibata in view of Kojima do not teach of a server separated with the output device storing the unique information, a device identification information of the output device and an information about outputted time, even after the output device outputs information onto media.

Miura teaches as follows:

The server (a server apparatus, 109 in figure 1, has a network communication control unit, a print information analysis unit, a slip template storing unit, an image forming unit, a data storing unit, a history information storing unit, a history information analysis unit, and a database (see, e.g., paragraph [0022]) separated with the output device (printing apparatus 106 in figure 1 executes the printing operation on the basis of the image data for printing which is transmitted for the client apparatus, see, e.g., paragraph [0025]) has a database (history information storing unit 115 in figure 1)(The history information storing unit 115 is a characteristic portion of the invention and stores print history information regarding the print based on the image data for printing, see,

e.g., paragraph [0027]) which stores the unique information (ID information of the operator who executed the print 204 in figure 2), the device identification information (print PC 203 in figure 2) and the information about outputted time (print time 202 in figure 2) in association with each other (see, e.g., paragraph [0028]), even after the output device outputs information onto media (In step S311, the network communication control unit 110 receives the notification showing that the print by the printing apparatus 106 has completely been finished from the client apparatus 100 side. Thus, in step S312, the history information analysis unit 116 forms the print history information. In step S313, the print history information is stored into the history information storing unit 115, see, e.g., paragraph [0037]);

storing the unique information and the device identification information (the print history information is stored into the history information storing unit, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0037]);

a server apparatus has a network communication control unit, a print information analysis unit, a slip template storing unit, an image forming unit, a data storing unit, a history information storing unit, a history information analysis unit, and a database (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0022]); and

identification information of the client apparatus which executed the print (equivalent to applicant's identification information of the output device) based on the image data for printing and ID information of the operator (equivalent to applicant's unique information) who executed the print based on the image data for printing (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0028] and figure 2).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Miura with Shibata in view of Kojima to include a separate server apparatus storing the print history as taught by Miura in order to efficiently reprint from the history information storing unit.

Regarding claim 2, Shibata teaches as follows:

a database (storage unit 108 in figure 2) in which output prohibited information which is prohibited to be outputted by the output device or output permitted information which is permitted to be outputted by the output device is registered (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]);

a matching unit which matches information received from the output device with the information registered in the database (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing command in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]); and

a matching unit which transmits alarm information to the output device or an information processing terminal for an administrator (displaying user ID error message, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0052]) or stops the output if the matching unit determines as the result of the matching that information matches the output prohibited information or does not match the output permitted information (by embedding printing prohibition information in place of the user's ID a printing operation by all users can be prohibited, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0054]).

Shibata does not teach a server database stored output prohibited or permitted information instead of the storage unit in the output device (MFP).

Kojima teaches the secrecy management information stored on the PC (1 in figure 1) to accommodate to the updating of the managed information, the limitation of allowing to display or to print for a person who accesses to the data in speedy (see, e.g., col. 16, lines 22-29).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shibata in view of Miura to include a server database storing the secrecy management information as taught by Kojima in order to manage multiple output devices together with one dedicated PC or server.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Shibata teaches as follows:

a database (storage unit 108 in figure 2) in which output prohibited information which is prohibited to be outputted by the output device or output permitted information which is permitted to be outputted by the output device is registered (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]); and

a matching unit which matches information received from the output device with the information registered in the database (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing command in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the output device ID stored in the database when multiple output devices are managed by one server or PC.

Regarding claims 5 and 10, it would be obvious to separate the read unit from the output device as an information processing terminal as claimed. Therefore they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claim 1.

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 14, they are rejected with same reason as presented above per claims 2 and 5.

Regarding claim 7, Shibata teaches as follows:

an output information database in which the ID information received from the information processing terminal and output information in association with each other (user information stored in the storage unit and the user IDs of the users permitted to implement printing of the image data are read from the user information, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0060]); and

a unit which stores the ID information received from the information processing terminal in association with output information that does not match the output prohibited information or output information that matches the output permitted information as the result of the matching by the matching unit (matching the user information from MFP with a user inputs the printing command in the PC, see, e.g., step 209 in figure 5 and page 3, paragraph [0053]).

Regarding claims 8, 11 and 13, they are rejected for similar reason as presented above per claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

March 24, 2010

Art Unit: 2454

***/NATHAN FLYNN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454***